REMARKS

Claims 1-58 are presented for prosecution. Claims 1, 23, and 43 are currently amended. No claim is cancelled.

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretschneider et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,128,629) in view of Skinner (U.S. Publication 2003/0033311) and further in view of Gabai et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,363,177).

Claims 3, 14, 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretschneider et al. in view of Skinner et al. as applied to claims 1-2, 4-11, 13, and 15-17, and further in view of Stone et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,829,587).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretschneider et al. in view of Skinner et al. as applied to 1-2, 4-11, 13, and 15-17, and further in view of Kouznetsov (U.S. Publication 2003/0135821).

Claims 23-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretschneider et al. in view of Stone et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,829,587), and further in view of Kouznetsov (U.S. Publication 2003/0135821).

In regards to claim 1, the Office Action repeats its assertion that Bretschneider et al. teach an internet presentation creation and access system comprising a network server controlling the creation and execution access of presentation files over the internet and for maintaining a store of previously created presentation files. Applicants had previously explained that Bretschneider et al. describe a system by which a software vendor (i.e. a presentation software vendor) may provide software updates on its website, and customers may link to the website to download object file updates. Apparently, the Office Action is assuming that the present claim language includes the possibility that the claimed presentation files on the server may be created by the software vendor, rather than by the users. To remove any unintended ambiguity, claim 1 has been amended to specify that the server controls "the user-creation and user-execution access of presentation files over the internet, and for maintaining a store of previously user-created presentation files".

The Office Action further asserts that Skinner shows purchasable-file group associating each respective registered user to presentation files to which the respective registered user has previously been granted purchase access. Applicants previously explained that Skinner shows a system for collaboration of suppliers through shared data bases of products to link suppliers to prospective customers. Skinner may maintain a database of registered users, and may select what data base items to show to a prospective customer based on customer-provided search criteria, but Skinner does not show the storage of pre-made presentation files created by the users themselves (i.e. prospective customers). Rather, Skinner's server gathers data based one entries from the suppliers and generates a display list "on the fly" (i.e. in real time, in response to customer submitted search criteria). Furthermore, a customer cannot buy a presentation file (i.e. the listing display provided by Skinner's server). Rather, if Skinner's customers find an item they want to buy, they may then enter into negotiations with the supplier of the item to purchase the item itself, not the screen display of the item.

The office Action asserts that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Skinner with those of Bretschneider et al. because that, "would enable the user that have the granted purchase access to see and edit the presentation that has been stored on the presentation file (see Skinner, page 1, paragraph 7) and would enable th user to access the information of the presentation through the computer anyplace an in any time because with the correct password the user can access all the presentation that where stored on the network server". Applicants respectfully point out that the presently claimed invention does not permit those that have purchases access to also edit a presentation on the network. Such a combination is contrary to the present invention. Rather, in order to purchase a presentation, the user must have purchase access, and in order to edit a presentation on the server, the user must have separate edit access. Furthermore, there is no incentive to combine the teachings of Bretschneider et al. and Skinner since Bretschneider et al. already provides full download access of its update object files without the need of a user ID. Once a user has downloaded a updated object file, the user may use it freely on his

personal computing device. Furthermore, even if Bretschneider et al. and Skinner were to be combined, one would still not achieve the present invention since neither Bretschneider et al. nor Skinner teach or suggest a server that controls the user-creation, user-edit, user-purchase, nor user-provided access permission of user-created *presentation files*.

The Office Action lastly asserts that Gabai et al. teach a toy wherein "the user-to-presentation file grouping information includes a created-file group associating each respective registered user to presentation files created by the respective registered user (see column 86, lines 1-7), a user-access device for communicating with the network server over the internet, ...and accepting purchase orders for only those presentation files whose purchase-file group associates the target user (see column 73, lines 31-33 and column 86, lines 1-7)". Applicants respectfully point out that Gabai et al., as is explained in the above cited excerpts, describes a network purchase system wherein a parent may submit limiting parameters (such as maximum price) to limit the search results provided to a user (i.e. a child) with a listing of items for purchases. Gabai et al. explain that their server generate the list of purchase items based on the limiting parameters, and accepts purchase order for only those items. Gabai et al. do not teach or suggest a "created-file group associating each respective registered user to presentation files created by the respective registered user". Rather, Gabai et al. generate the item listing themselves. The users in Gabai et al.'s invention may be construed to be either the parent or child, but nether create presentation files and store the presentation files on Gabai et al.'s server. Also, Gabai et al. do not provide for the purchase of presentation files. Rather, Gabai et al. accept purchase orders for the items they place on display.

In regards to claim 2, nether Bretschneider et al. nor Skinner et al. show one user have control over (i.e. assigning) what presentation files a second may purchase. The cited excerpt merely explains that Skinner et al.'s server generate a customer display of prospective purchase items and suppliers based on user requirements. Neither Bretschneider et al. nor Skinner et al. show one user assigning purchase permission for a specific presentation file to a specific other

user. Applications request that the Examiner kindly explain her position more clearly.

As to claim 5, Bretschneider et al. nor Skinner et al. show that a first user may withdraw execution permission to a presentation file form a second user. As was explained before, Bretschneider et al. show a software update routine. Bretschneider et al. do not have any control over the update once it has been installed on the client's machine. Furthermore, Skinner et al. do not have any user-created, execution presentation files, as used in the present invention. Rather as explained above, Skinner et al. generate a listing of products for display to prospective customers. No one customer may limit what another customer may view, nor are there any user-created presentation files to limit in the first place.

The remaining rejections are based on a similar misconception. Applicants kindly request that the Bretschneider et al. and Skinner et al. reference be re-considered in view of the present amendments.

In reference to claims 23-58, claims 23 and 43 have been amended to more clearly specify that the recited "data store" maintains a plurality of "user-created presentation files". Claim 23 (and 43) is further amended to clarify that the recited network server is effective for controlling user-creation access, user-edit access, user-execution access, and user-purchase access of said plurality of presentation files over the internet. As explained above, this distinction is in direct conflict with the teachings of Bretschneider et al., which require that their server maintain presentation object update files generated by the software provider for software update purposes, and does not maintain or control user creation, user execution, user purchase, or any user permissions.

In reference to claim 24 (and 43), neither Bretschneider et al. nor Kouznetsov sell any presentation files. As explained above, Bretschneider et al. disclose a server maintained by a software vendor for providing automatic software updated (free of charge) to all users of their software. Bretschneider et al. does not maintain any user-created application files, nor does it impose any network permission limitations on users. Kouznetsov describe a presentation

creation software written for execution using the Flash utility from Macromedia. Kousnetsov does teach that the user-created presentation may be stored on the server, and that the creator of a presentation file may place the file in either a public folder or a private folder. If placed in the public folder, then anybody may access the presentation file, and if placed in a private folder, then only select people may access the presentation file. However Kouzetsov does not teach or suggest selling the user-created presentation files over the network. Furthermore, Kouzetsov explains that the creator of a presentation file, alone, has full control over the created presentation file. By contrast, claim 24 specifies that multiple users may have owner status associated with a single presentation file, each having the ability to give and remove access permission to other non-owner users. Also, claim 24 disallows the remove of permission from an owner-status user by another owner-status user. None of the cited prior art teach or suggest this type of group control over a user-created presentation file.

In regards to claim 25 (and 44), it further specifies what type of user may add or remove permissions. Kouzetsov teaches that only one user has control over a user-created presentation file (i.e. the presentation file created by the user himself/herself), and provides no mechanism for shared control by multiple user of a specific presentation file, in a manner as presently claimed. Also, Applicants respectfully point out that none of the cited art teach or suggest the sale of user-created presentation files by one registered user to select other users.

In reference to claim 32 (and 48), the present invention further states that among the owner-status users with permission to assign and remove purchase or edit or view access to other registered users (in reference to a particular user-created presentation file), a higher priority user (i.e. a super-owner user) may remove the owner-status (and thus remove the right to assign and remove permissions) of other users. Kouzetsov does not teach or suggest this type of hierarchical control of presentation files. Kouzetsov teaches that the creator of a presentation file may choose who may access the presentation file, but does not teach or suggest that the creator of the presentation file himself may have his/her access removed by another user.

This is made clear in claim 33 (and 49), wherein it specifies the "registered user having said super-owner status is further permitted to relinquish its super-owner status to any other registered user within its corresponding purchase permission group".   As explained above, none of the cited prior art teach or suggest this type of hieratical group/super-owner access sharing scheme.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

<div style="text-align: right;">

Respectfully submitted,

Rosalio Haro
Registration No. 42,633

</div>

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: November 2, 2005